

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

Nithya Vinayagam,

Plaintiff,

v.

US Dept Labor-Administrative Review  
Board, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-01206-RFB-DJA

**ORDER**

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 12] of the Honorable Daniel J. Albregts, United States Magistrate Judge, entered April 27, 2020.

A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct “any review,” de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by May 11, 2020. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations.


...

1           **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 12] is  
2   ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.

3           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this case is DISMISSED without prejudice.

4           The Court Clerk is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff.

5           DATED: May 28, 2020.

6  
7             
8           \_\_\_\_\_  
9           **RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II**  
10          United States District Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28